APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/628,564	07/29/2003	Karsten Schulz	13909-026002 / 2002P00222	4833

32864	7590	07/27/2006

FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C.
PO BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER
CHAVIS, JOHN Q

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2193	

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>*29 July 2003*</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.** 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-32* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-32* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/18/05</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

2.   Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Aissi et

al. (E-Business Process Modeling...".

What is claimed is:	Aissi
1. A method of modifying an Abstraction level of a workflow, the Method comprising:	Aissi provides for modifying an abstraction level via page 55 under the section entitled process Coordination framework, specifically the first dot entitled service description and transport binding (see the abstract service Description).
analyzing a workflow to determine a first plurality of tasks;	See the first paragraph on page 55, in which services use software components to enable dynamic interactions.
combining the first plurality of tasks into a first virtual task within an abstracted workflow; and	See the third paragraph on page 55, which uses a process coordination framework.
linking the first virtual task to the first plurality of tasks such that a virtual execution of the abstracted workflow corresponds to an actual execution of the workflow.	See the five dots on the top left side of page 59
2. The method of claim 1 wherein the `	" " " "

workflow further comprises a second plurality of tasks, and

wherein combining the first plurality of tasks comprises combining the second plurality of tasks into a second virtual task within the abstracted workflow.

3. The method of claim 2 wherein linking the first virtual task to the first plurality of tasks comprises linking the second virtual task to the second plurality of tasks such that a virtual execution of the abstracted workflow corresponds to an actual execution of the workflow.

"   "   "   "

.

4. The method of claim 3 wherein analyzing the workflow comprises: determining that a last task within the first plurality of tasks precedes at most one subsequent task within the second plurality of tasks within the workflow.

See the second full paragraph on page 58, which indicates that "As figure 4 shows... ordering of transactions..."

5. The method of claim 4 wherein analyzing the workflow further comprises determining that no internal task within the first plurality of tasks, exclusive of the last task, immediately precedes an external task that is not included within the first plurality of tasks.

"   "   "   "

6. The method of claim 4 wherein analyzing the workflow further comprises determining that no internal task within the first plurality of tasks, exclusive of a first task of the first plurality of tasks, immediately succeeds an external task that is not included

"   "   "   "

within the first plurality of tasks.

7. The method of claim 3 wherein analyzing the workflow comprises determining whether a plurality of conditions are met, and further wherein determining whether the plurality of conditions are met comprises:

inputting a selected task from the first plurality of tasks, the selected task being a first task of the first plurality of tasks; considering each succeeding task of the selected task until a last task of the first plurality of tasks is reached, wherein the last task precedes at most one subsequent task within the second plurality of tasks within the workflow;

determining that no internal task within the first plurality of tasks, exclusive of the last task, immediately precedes an external task that is not included within the first plurality of tasks;

and determining that no internal task within the first plurality of tasks, exclusive of the first task, immediately succeeds an external task that is not included within the first plurality of tasks.

8. The method of claim 7 further comprising: determining that the plurality of conditions are not met; considering a preceding task outside of the first plurality of tasks and preceding the first plurality of tasks within

the workflow, the preceding task
immediately preceding at least a
first pair of tasks;

determining that the last task
within the first plurality of tasks
is immediately preceded by at
least a second pair of tasks; and

defining a modified first plurality
of tasks comprising the preceding
task, the last task, and all
intervening tasks.

9. The method of claim 8 wherein
combining the first plurality of tasks
comprises combining the modified
first plurality of tasks into the first
virtual task within the abstracted
workflow.

"   "   "   "

10. The method of claim 1 wherein
analyzing the workflow comprises
selecting all task subsets of the
workflow which, when used as the
first plurality of tasks, allow the
linking of the first virtual task to the
first plurality of tasks.

"   "   "   "

.

11. The method of claim 1 wherein
analyzing the workflow comprises:
inputting a selected task from among
the workflow; and determining a first
subset of tasks inclusively preceding
the selected task which, when used
as the first plurality of tasks, allow the
linking of the first virtual task to the
first plurality of tasks.

"   "   "   "

12. The method of claim 11 further
comprising determining a second
subset of tasks inclusively succeeding
the selected task which, when used as
the first plurality of tasks, allow the

"   "   "   "

linking of the first virtual task to the
first plurality of tasks.

13. The method of claim 1 wherein
analyzing the workflow comprises:
expressing actual tasks within the
first plurality of tasks as first vertices
within a first matrix, wherein values
of the first vertices within the first
matrix are determined by actual
dependencies between the tasks
within the first plurality of tasks, and
wherein combining the first plurality
of tasks into a first virtual task further
comprises expressing virtual tasks
within the abstracted workflow as
second vertices within a second
matrix, wherein values of the second
vertices within the second matrix are
determined by virtual dependencies
between the virtual tasks within the
abstracted workflow.

See the second paragraph on
page 57 under the section
entitled "Web Services
Conversation Language".

14. The method of claim 13 wherein
linking the first virtual task to the
first plurality of tasks comprises
replacing a selected plurality of the
first vertices with a selected one of
the second vertices.

See the first full paragraph
on the right side of page 58,
which provides for dynamically
overriding (replacing)
information.

15. The method of claim 13 wherein
linking the first virtual task to the first
plurality of tasks comprises replacing
a selected one of the second
vertices with a selected plurality of
the first vertices.

"   "   "   "

16. The method of claim 1 wherein
the first plurality of tasks within the
workflow are confidential tasks
associated with a first party, and
wherein the abstracted workflow
permits communications regarding
the confidential tasks without

See the end of the paragraph
on page 56 that started on
page 55 and the first dot on
the right hand side of page 56.

divulging the confidential nature of
the confidential tasks.

In reference to claims 17-32, see the rejections of claim 1-16 above.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to John Chavis whose telephone number is (571) 272-
3720. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:00am-4:30pm, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on (571) 272-3719. The fax phone number for
the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the
Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for
published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.
Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.
For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should
you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic
Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a
USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information
system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JC

John Chavis
Primary Examiner AU-2193